



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,540	10/12/2001	Genady Grabarnik	YOR920010746US1	1483

7590 06/29/2005  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
90 Forest Avenue  
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER
----------

LIN, KELVIN Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/976,540

Applicant(s)

GRABARNIK ET AL.

Examiner

Kelvin Lin

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Detailed Action**

### ***Response to Remarks***

Application's argue with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **Response to Amended Claims**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-3, 7-18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Cookmeyer II et al., (U.S. Patent 6529954).
2. Regarding claim 1, Cookmeyer teaches apparatus for providing decision support to an analyst in accordance with an event management system which manages a network with one or more computing devices, the apparatus comprising: at least

one processor operative to perform (Cookmeyer, col.4, l.9-11):

- an automated off-line analysis of data representing past events associated with the network of computing devices being managed by the event management system, the automated analysis comprising generation of one or more visualizations of one or more portions of the past event data and discovery of one or more patterns in the past event data (Cookmeyer, col.3, l.17-38, in which a knowledge based expert analysis corresponds to a automated analysis system, col.5, l.58-67, col.21, l.47-55, hereafter, the offline implementation will refer to ); and
- automated rule management comprising construction and validation of one or more rules formed in accordance with the automated off-line analysis of the past event data (Cookmeyer, col.3, l.17-20, l.32-38, col.5, l.58-67); and
- memory, coupled to the at least one processor, which stores at least a portion of results associated with the automated event off-line analysis and off-line rule management operations (Cookmeyer, col.7, l.15-24)

3. Regarding claim 2, Cookmeyer further discloses the apparatus of claim 1, Wherein,  
  
the past event data is obtained from an event database and the one or more rules are provided to a rule database, the event database and the rule database

Art Unit: 2142

being associated with an execution system of the event management system.

(Cookmeyer, col.25, l.37-43).

4. Regarding claim 3, Cookmeyer further discloses the apparatus of claim 2, Wherein,
- generation of the one or more visualizations of the one or more portions of the past event data further comprises:

- selecting a subset of the past event data from the event database (Cookmeyer, col.22, l.13-33);
  - generating a visualization of the subset of past event data using a visualization tool (Cookmeyer, col.21, l.47-55);
  - the analyst reviewing the visualization to determine whether there are any groupings of events that are of interest presented therein (Cookmeyer, col.22, l.34-38);
- and
- performing an appropriate action when an event grouping of interest is found (Cookmeyer, col.22, l.41-47).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2142

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cookmeyer in view of Hellerstein et al., (U.S. PG Pub No. 2002/0073195).
6. Regarding claim 4, Cookmeyer teaches features of the invention substantially as claimed, discovery of the one or more patterns in the past event data, selecting a subset of the past event data from the event database (Cookmeyer, col.22, I.50-63); generating a visualization of the one or more patterns using a visualization tool (Cookmeyer, col.22, I.61-63, statistics corresponds to the pattern).the analyst reviewing the visualization to determine whether there are any patterns of interest presented therein (Cookmeyer, col.23, I.1-10); and performing an appropriate action when a pattern of interest is found (Cookmeyer, col.23, I.28-33). Although the above mentioned prior art teaches event analysis using visualization, not including the mining algorithm.

However, Hellerstein teaches mining the subset of the past event data to discover the one or more patterns using a mining tool (Hellerstein, [0053], I.2-12).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Hellerstein for data mining algorithm as is well-known in the art to aid in finding patterns of interest (Hellerstein, [0053], I. 5).

The motivation would be for offline data analysis, event management using mining algorithm tool be implemented under Cookmeyer features to perform offline expert, protocol analysis (Cookmeyer, col.5, l.60-63).

7. Regarding claim 5, Hellerstein further discloses the apparatus of claim 2, wherein validation of the one or more rules farther comprises :

- selecting a subset of the past event data from the event database (Hellerstein, [0052], l.1-3);
- finding one or more instances of patterns expressed in terms of left-hand sides of rules (Hellerstein, [0027], l.2-3);
- generating a visualization of the one or more pattern instances using a visualization tool (Hellerstein, [0023], l.13);
- analyzing the left-hand sides of rules using a rule validation tool (Hellerstein, [0026], l.5-8);
- displaying results of the analysis operation (Hellerstein, [0046], l.5-6, [0052], l.7-8);
- the analyst assessing analysis results (Hellerstein, [0028], l.1-2);
- and
- marking the rules as one of validated and not validated based on the assessment by the analyst (Hellerstein, [0023], l.16-18,[0028], l.6-11).

8. Regarding claim 6, Hellerstein further discloses the apparatus of claim 2, wherein construction of the one or more rules further comprises:

- selecting a subset of the past event data from the event database (Hellerstein, [0052], I.1-3);
- mining the subset of the past event data to discover the one or more patterns using a mining tool (Hellerstein, [0025], I.2);
- assessing significance of the one or more patterns using a visualization tool (Hellerstein, [0023], I.13);
- constructing the one or more rules from a selected subset of the one or more patterns using a rule construction tool (Hellerstein, [0026], I.3-9); and
- writing the one or more rules in the rule database (Hellerstein, [0026], I.8-11).

9. Regarding claims 7-12 have similar limitations as claims 1-6, the difference is one is claimed for apparatus, and the other is claimed for method.

Therefore, claims 7-12 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-6.

10. Regarding claims 13-14 have similar limitations as claims 7-8, the difference is one is claimed for method, and the other is claimed for manufacture.

Therefore, claims 13-14 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 7-8.

11. Regarding claims 15-16 have similar limitations as claims 1-2, the difference is



one is claimed for apparatus, and the other is claimed for means function.

Therefore, claims 15-16 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-2.

12. Regarding claims 17-18 have similar limitations as claims 1-2, the difference is one is claimed for apparatus, and the other is claimed for event support system. Therefore, claims 17-18 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-2.

### ***Conclusion***

Application's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action, Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MEPE 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTH from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelvin Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-3898. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible 4/9/5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

06/23/05  
KYL

  
**ANDREW CALDWELL**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**